REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated May 8, 2008. Claims 1-20 are currently pending. Claims 10-18 have been amended. New matter has not been added with the amendments to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

Section 101 Rejections

Claims 10-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims fail to satisfy the requirements of Section 101. However, the claims have been amended to address the concerns of the Examiner.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0158960 A1 to Engberg ("Engberg"). Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are unpatentable over the cited reference.

Claim 1 recites:

sequencing an encryption key transaction from a trusted service for generating for an individual a consumer identifier by performing the steps of:
issuing from said trusted service a primary key to the individual;
issuing to the individual a unique identifier from said trusted service; and
permitting the individual to generate and maintain a consumer-defined sequence through said trusted service.

The Engberg reference fails to teach at least these features of the claim. The Office Action states that these features are taught because the Engberg reference teaches, in paragraph 0400, that a consumer identifier is generated using trusted services by issuing a key and identifier from the trusted service. However, the cited portions of the Engberg reference teaches that a trusted party creates a key pair, the public key component is forwarded to and signed by the

Applicant : William M. Brandt   Attorney's Docket No.: 14012-071001 / 70-03-007
Serial No. : 10/729,398
Filed   : December 5, 2003
Page   : 9 of 10

client, and then the signature is returned to the trusted party (Engberg, paragraph 0400). This is not the same as sequencing an encryption key transaction from a trusted service for generating for an individual a consumer identifier by issuing from a trusted service a primary key to the individual, issuing to the individual a unique identifier from said trusted service, and permitting the individual to generate and maintain a consumer-defined sequence through said trusted service. The Engberg reference fails to teach generating a consumer identifier for an individual and permitting this individual to generate and maintain a consumer-defined sequence through said trusted service. Accordingly, claim 1 and its corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

      Independent claims 10 and 19 include limitations similar to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons previously mentioned in connection with claim 1, claims 10 and 19 and their corresponding dependent claims are allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 8, 2008

/Elizabeth Philip Dahm/
Elizabeth Philip Dahm
Reg. No. 51,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 760-6119
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

90290314.doc